



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/295,690 04/21/99 MOUTON

J 081862.P122

TM02/0308
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

EXAMINER

FLEURANTIN, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED:

03/08/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/295,690

Applicant(s)
Jerom A Mouton Jr. et al.

Examiner
Jean Bolte Fleurantin

Group Art Unit
2172



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 21, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg (US Pat. No. 5,970,503).

4. As per claims 1, 5, and 9 Eisenberg substantially teaches a method of updating a message from a first version to an upgraded version by chaining through intermediate versions as claimed, comprises receiving an update message having a first version format (thus, when an existing field is modified this generates a new field closely linked to the first on previous records, but with a new version, which is readable as receiving an update message having a first version format) (see col. 2, lines 23-25). But, Eisenberg does not explicitly show the step of repeatedly generating a revised update message having a next most recent version format based on the update message until a final update message having an upgraded version format is generated. However, implicitly

Art Unit: 2172

details step of from time to time in such a system it is necessary to revise the internal definitions that are used for the field, each time the internal definitions of data fields are changed this result in a new version of the database, if the change was made to information relating previous activities to the previous version information, then the change was applied to the database causing a new modified version of the database to exist, which is readable as repeatedly generating a revised update message having a next most recent version format based on the update message until a final update message having an upgraded version format is generated (see col. 1, lines 17-29). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary in the art at time the Applicant's invention was made to have modified the teachings of Eisenberg with the step of repeatedly generating a revised update message having a next most recent version format based on the update message until a final update message having an upgraded version format is generated, because such modification would allow the teachings of Eisenberg to provide list control which is able to identify the correlation of item usage with the entire list itself, and reconstructed through the correlation of different versions of elements of the database along with the effectivity control information (see col. 2, lines 8-14).

As per claims 2, 6, and 10 Eisenberg substantially teaches a method as claimed, wherein generating a revised update message having a next most recent version format includes: receiving a first update message (where, when an existing field is modified this generates a new field closely linked to the first on previous records, but with a new version, but all versions might have been

Art Unit: 2172

used in the past there are records in the system which define their active field as a previous version, which is readable as (see col. 2, lines 24-30);

calling a next most recent version mapping function to map contents of the first update message to generate a second update message (thus, then the change was applied to the database causing a new modified version of the database to exist, which is equivalent to the first update message to generate a second update message) (see col. 1, lines 25-29).

As per claims 3, 7, and 11 Eisenberg substantially teaches a method as claimed, wherein the update message includes a set of records for a database in the first version (where, if a new version of the list is created the new list item definitions are stored along with the version number, which is readable as wherein the update message includes a set of records for a database in the first version) (see col. 6, lines 40-45).

As per claims 4, 8, and 12 Eisenberg substantially teaches a method as claimed, wherein the set of records for the database in the first version is a complete set of records for the database (thus, each time a field definition is revised the definition is stored in database, when a previously created field definition is used there is no need to store its definition, which is readable as wherein the set of records for the database in the first version is a complete set of records for the database) (see col. 5, lines 3-6).

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2172

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from examiner should be directed to Jean Bolte Fleurantin at (703) 308-6718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 A.M. to 6.00 P.M.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. KIM VU can be reached at (703) 305-8449. The FAX phone number is (703) 305-9731.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone is (703) 305-9600.



Jean Bolte Fleurantin

March 6, 2001

JBF/



HOSAIN T. ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER